IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FB 13 PM 12: 36
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE STRICT COURT
CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

| JOHN ANTHONY GENTRY, sui juris/pro se    | )                    |
|--|----------------------|
| Plaintiff                                | )                    |
|  | ) CASE NO. 3:17-0020 |
| VS.                                      | )                    |
|  | )                    |
| THE TENNESSEE BOARD                      | )                    |
| OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT;                     | )                    |
| THE HONORABLE JUDGE CHRIS,               | ) JURY DEMANDED (12) |
| CRAFT, individual and official capacity; | )                    |
| TIMOTHY R. DISCENZA, individual and      | )                    |
| official capacity; UNNAMED MEMBERS OF    | )                    |
| INVESTIGATIVE PANEL, individual and      | )                    |
| official capacity; UNNAMED               | )                    |
| LIABILITY INSURANCE CARRIER(S),          | )                    |
| THE STATE OF TENNESSEE                   | )                    |
|  | )                    |
| Defendants                               | )                    |
|  | ,                    |

## PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR REVIEW MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S JANUARY 27, 2017 & FEBRUARY 7, 2017 ORDERS

Pursuant to Local Rules, U.S. District Court, Middle District of Tennessee, Rule 72.02 (b) and Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 72 (a), Plaintiff respectfully objects and requests the U.S. District Court Judge's Review of the Magistrate's Orders filed and entered into the record on January 27, 2017 and February 7, 2017.

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 6 and Local Rule 72.02 (b), Plaintiff's Objection and Motion for Court Review is filed timely. Local Rule 72.02 (b) states, such motions shall be filed within fourteen (14) days. Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 6 defines computing and extending time

to include three additional days to respond when service is by mail. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Objection and Motion for Review is filed timely on February 13, 2017 regarding both Orders issued by the Magistrate Judge

Plaintiff asserts, initial disclosures and customized case management would facilitate progression of the case in a manner designed to limit the burden on parties, while ensuring fair and just access to information essential to the disposition of Plaintiff's claims.

Plaintiff asserts, that an exemption from initial disclosures threatens to prejudice Plaintiff's ability to discover information essential to the resolution of the case.

Plaintiff asserts, providing notice by "first class mail (only) places Defendants at an advantage unfair to Plaintiff.

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 52 (a), Plaintiff hereby respectfully requests this Honorable Court state the basis, findings and conclusions supporting the court's orders. In further support of this motion, Plaintiff's Motion is accompanied by a Memorandum of Law in Support of his Motion.

## WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, PLAINTIFF PRAYS:

- 1. That the Court state its findings and conclusions used as a basis in determining that this case should be exempt from Customized Case Management, which would otherwise establish a program appropriate for just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of Plaintiff's cause of action;
- 2. That the Court state its findings and conclusions used as a basis in exempting Defendants from initial disclosures required by Rule 26(a)
- 3. That the Court modify its order regarding notice to parties, to provide Equal Protection guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment of the U.S. Const.

Respectfully submitted,

John Anthony Gentry, CPA, Pro Se 208 Navajo Court Goodlettsville, TN 37072 615-351-2649 john.a.gentry@comcast.net

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was sent via email and US Mail to;

Stephanie A. Bergmeyer Office of the Attorney General and Reporter P.O. Box 20207 Nashville, TN 37202-0207 Stephanie.bertmeyer@ag.tn.gov

On this the 13th day of February, 2017

John Anthony Gentry, CPA